



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | D. FILING DATE | | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|--|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/175,905 | 10/20/1998 DENNIS W. HICKS 7590 09/28/2004 | | DENNIS W. HICKS | 0142-0317P | 7486 |
| 2292 | | | EXAMINER | | |
| BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH | | | | BASHORE, WILLIAM L | |
| PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 111200 0110 | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | 2176 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004



PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on ____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: (a) Li they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below): (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: _____ 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: _____. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: _____. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. 8. The drawing correction filed on ____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 10. ☐ Other: WILLIAM L. BASHORE PATENT EXAMINER

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) <u>tech ce</u>nter 2100

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/175,905

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues on page 2 (at bottom) of the After Final Request that PDL is mentioned in the prior art discussion of Suzuki. It is repectfully noted that Suzuki also teaches a page description language (PDL) at Suzuki column 42 lines 18-24.

Applicant argues on pages 3-4 of the Request that the examiner has misrepresented the reference regarding "platform independent". It is respectfully noted that Guck teaches transformation of a file from one format to another format so as to be adaptable to various devices. Reading Guck's invention "as a whole" suggests at least a document stream which is ultimately "platform independent".

Applicant argues on page 5-6 of the Request that the cited art of record does not teach the limitations of claim 4 and 148. It is respectfully noted that different printer device capabilities are quantified by Goertz for appreopriate selection (i.e. there are quantifiable differences between the three models of printers listed in Gaoertz, such as color capacity). This at least suggests analyzing values in order to compare and select the appropriate printer for a print job.